



LP  
F  
5012  
1829  
C





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2012 with funding from  
Queen's University - University of Toronto Libraries

<http://archive.org/details/remarksmadetomrg00calc>



F 1021

York! F

1629

## TO MR. GEORGE RYERSON.

SIR.

The following remarks are made on the evidence given by you before the Committee of the House of Commons, on the Civil Government of Canada, in 1828. If you think proper you can answer them: if you decline to reply, your silence must be construed into an acquiescence of their correctness.

You assnme the population to be . . . . . 200,000.

And at page 222, of the minutes of evidence, you say that about one fifth part of that population is Methodists, or . . . . . 40,000.

Which leaves . . . . . 160,000, for other denominations.

How you account for the whole 200,000, I shall endeavour to ascertain from your evidence; for if you are condemned, it shall be on your own shewing—out of your own mouth.

At page 217, you say, without any qualification whatever, that “the Methodists are the most numerous”—and you are a Methodist yourself. For argument sake, take we this for granted,—it may possibly be so in fact.

You are then asked, “What denomination is *next* to them (the Methodists) in number?” to which you answer—“I think the different classes of Presbyterians.” Now, before I go any farther, to preserve order, I take what you term the *most* numerous.

1st. The Methodists, . . . . . 40,000.

2d. *Next*, “the different classes of Presbyterians,” giving you fair play, say . . . . . 39,999.

3d. Following this mode of interrogation, you are again asked, “What denomination do you conceive to be *next* to them (the Presbyterians) in number?” you answer, “I think the *Church of England*, and the *Baptists*, are about *equal in number*, and *next* to the Presbyterians.” Now if we can ascertain the number of Baptists, we shall come pretty nearly at what you would represent as being the number of the *Church of England*; for you say they are about equal. Here then, there is not much of difficulty to shew what you would represent that number to be, although you do not speak it out in terms. I come at it in the following manner:—You say, with respect to Mr. Morrison’s Chart, that, “much pains was taken to ascertain the correctness of its returns.”—That Chart gives the Baptists 5740: the *Church of Engtand* then, according to your account, “about equal,” will give as her number, . . . . .

5,740.  
5,740.

4th. And for the *Baptists*, the same, . . . . .

5th. Then, with respect to the *Catholics*, you are asked—“Do you conceive them to be very numerous?” You answer generally, that, “in the Upper District there are a *few* Townships of *French Canadians*,—and in the lower part, a Township of *Highland Scotch*, who are Roman Catholics”—you are further asked—“Are there many *Irish Catholics*?” you answer, “there are *some few* in the new Townships recently inhabited.” Supposing them, however, to be “*next*” in the order assumed in your evidence, we shall have, giving you fair play again, . . . . .

5,739.

6th. For other sects and denominations, I take the following as my guide, and as I mean, Mr. Ryerson, to make you speak for yourself, I ground it upon your own words. You are then asked, “how Mr. Morrison’s Chart was formed, and what means were taken to insure its correctness?” You tell the Committee in reply, that, “much pains was taken to ascertain the correctness of the returns”—that the “Secretary (of the Central Committee) wrote to

80  
80  
80  
80  
80

and

ministers and other intelligent individuals"—and above all, that "the Chart was *published* in Canada, where any errors *would* (not *could*) be discovered and exposed, by those interested in the subject." Take we then, that "Chart," in the compilation of which "so much pains was taken," for the remaining denominations.—It gives us—Menonists and Tunkers,

7th. Wesleyan Methodists,

2,388.  
100.

8th. But that it may not be said that I omit to give you credit for any other that should be included in the reckoning, let me refer you, Mr. Ryerson, to your "additional particulars," at page 222, relative to the religious denominations of Upper Canada. "These are," you say, "1st. Episcopalians, 2d. Presbyterians, 3d. Methodists, 4th. Baptists, 5th. Quakers, 6th. Menonists, 7th. Roman Catholics, and a *few* others, *very inconsiderable* in number." In the enumeration I have already made, I have included the whole of your 7 classes, except "Quakers"—Of these the Chart of the Central Committee says nothing—Allowing them to be your last "next"—fair play again, to swell the number for you, we shall have, after Roman Catholics,

9th. The *rest*, whom you describe as "a *few* others, *inconsiderable* in number," it will certainly be doing you no injustice to rank in the *lump*, as "next," or,

10th. To this I add one fifth of the whole population, taking *your own words*, at page 220, where you say—"I should think that one fifth part of the population in Canada do not belong to any religious denomination"—and this, I believe, includes the whole of your account, "additional particulars" and all,

5,738.  
5,737.

40,000.

Giving a total of . . . . . 151,181.

Now then, Mr. Ryerson, for the result.

200,000.

The total population you estimate at . . . . .

Giving you fair play, by the utmost extent of numbers, you account as above, for . . . . .

151,181.

Will you be pleased, Mr. Ryerson, to tell us what has become of the balance of . . . . . which you have lost sight of, sunk, and forgotten altogether?

48,819.

Take another view of your result.

48,819,

If to your unaccounted number of . . . . . is added the one fifth, who, as you say, "do not belong to any religious denomination," . . . . .

40,000,

you give us a total of . . . . . souls in Upper Canada, wandering without shepherds—more than two fifths (frightful!) of the whole population—one fifth, neither hot nor cold towards any religious denomination; and more than another fifth, totally sunk in the estimate. Is not this incredible, Mr. Ryerson? and if the Committee before which you gave your evidence should have taken the trouble to make such a calculation as is here made, what must they have thought of that evidence, coming as it did, from a person that tells them as you do, (page 216) "that you are acquainted with the Provinces of Canada, that you have lived there about 28 years, and that you are a Landowner and a Magistrate in the District of London in Upper Canada, and have been for a number of years?"

88,819,

As Agent for the "Central Committee," you say that it was your object "to vindicate the character of *certain* religious denominations." You have certainly "vindicated" as you are pleased to call it, a "certain" denomina-

tion, at the expense of 88,819 of our inhabitants, whom you represent as being without any fixed religious principles, or what is perhaps as bad or worse, you sink altogether in the account. Can you suppose, Mr. Ryerson, that any reasonable man, on reading the foregoing calculation, founded as it is on your own evidence, will not say that you have been guilty of misrepresentation; and, that you have done any thing but vindicate any, except a "*certain*" denomination.

Let me now offer you a few observations on some of the above sects, comparing your statements made in London, with those of others made before a Committee of the House of Assembly in Upper Canada, on the same subject, for by the management of the "*Central Committee*" the Farce has been enacted in both places; and by comparing them also, with other statements which have gone abroad.

And, first—I shall take the Roman Catholics:—

The Rev. Angus McDonald, in his examination before the Committee of our House of Assembly, in 1828, says that he believes there are . . . . .

42,000.

Your account of them, giving you every allowance, by extending the number to its utmost possible limits that your "*nexts*" will admit of—makes them about . . . . .

6,000.

36,000.

The difference, and truly an amazing one, is . . . . .

Second—As to Presbyterians, Dr. Lee, in his report to the General Assembly, from information received from the Colony, says, there are "*warmly attached to the Church of Scotland*," (not "*different classes*")— . . . . .

150,000.

Your account of them *all*, says, as I have before stated, giving you every allowance in the power of numbers, consistent with previous evidence, . . . . .

39,999.

The difference between you and Dr. Lee, is . . . . .  
to say nothing of the difference between you of "*different classes*," and "*warmly attached to the Church of Scotland*." But, giving you both credit for speaking the truth, each of your own sect, this reckoning will form a curious item in the general calculation.

110,001.

He says there are Presbyterians, . . . . .

150,000.

You say there are Methodists, . . . . .

40,000.

Which would make . . . . .

190,000.

Leaving only . . . . .

10,000.

to be divided among all others, to make up your estimate of the population, . . . . .

200,000.

It must be placed to the credit of the account, however, as far as you are concerned, that, while your estimate of the population is 200,000—Dr. Lee, from *Colonial* information, (amazing!) tacks on another 100,000, and calls it 300,000—one half of which number, from the same source of information, more amazing!!) he states to be "*warmly attached to the Church of Scotland*;" so that in your estimate of Presbyterians, you differ 110,001, and in our estimate of population you differ 100,000, (most amazing!!!)

Third—with respect to the Church of England: After going through your "*next*" and "*next*," you are asked, "what proportion do you conceive the members of the Church of England bears to the whole population in Upper Canada?" you answer, "*It is impossible for me to say*," and for once you answer wisely. But the Committee are determined to get something out of you, and you are then asked—"Do you think they are one tenth part?" You reply—"I do not think they are." But this, too, is considered vague and

you are pushed into a corner by being asked—"Do you think they are a fifteenth?" and to this you answer, "It is *probable* they do amount to that, or *perhaps* one tenth;" and you add what the question had nothing to do with—"I should think one fifth do not belong to any religious denomination." Now, Mr. Ryerson, when you was pushed home by these questions you seem to have forgotten (or perhaps you were confused, that you said before, in your examination, page 217) that "the *Church of England* and *Baptists* are about *equal in number*." Now, Sir, about the Baptists, by your own shewing, there can, as you would have it believed, be no doubt, for you say (same page) that Mr. Morrison's Chart gives a "full" account of them, they (and the Methodists, as you say,) keeping "accurate accounts" of all their societies, were able to furnish "specific information;" if then they, and the Church of England are as you say, "about equal," it would give to the Church of England about one fortieth part of the population, for Mr. Morrison's return, as "accurate account," and "specific information," from the Baptists, gives their number in his Chart at 5,740. So that, in one place you say, it is "*probable*" the Church of England may amount to one fifteenth, (you add "perhaps one tenth,") or . . . . . 13,000.

And in another place, where you say she is "about equal" with the Baptists, you make her proportion only about one fortieth, or 5,000.

Making a difference between your two statements of . . . . . 8,000.

Will you be pleased to explain which of the two you mean for the true one; but have a care that you do not get confused again.

These, Sir, are amazing differences, but I must take the liberty of pointing out a few more to you. There is no end of them; for what between thousands, and tens of thousands, and tenths, and fifteenths, and fortieths—there is a strange jumble of confusion; and you will perhaps wonder that any one should have taken the trouble to unravel it; but *Cocker* has always been a favourite with me.—I know that with a little trouble, and some patience, he can put all these things to rights, and when I hear a person say that two and two make four "according to Cocker," I recognize him as a man of *fact* and *figures*. But to proceed—Let us see how you differ in your account of the Church of England from the statements made by others, before the Committee of our House of Assembly. The following table will shew this, for the correctness of which I refer you to the celebrated report of the Committee on the petition of Buckley Waters and others.

### TABLE.

*ANSWER to the Question—"What proportion, in your opinion, do the Members of the Church of England in this Province bear to the whole Population?"*

Answered by

	Elder Case,	The Rev. A. Stewart,	D. McCall, M.P.	E. McBride, M.P.	Rev. Mr. Barclay,	Dr. Dunlop,	F. Baby, M.P.	Rev. Mr. Harris,	Rev. A. Mac Donell,	Hon. W. Dickson,
Or Mr. Ryerson's Estimate. "Equal to Baptists,"	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	19	19	12	20	19	6	10	25	6	20
	11,111	11,111	15,384	10,000	1,111	33,333	20,000	8,000	33,333	10,000
	5,740	5,740	5,740	5,740	5,740	5,740	5,740	5,740	5,740	5,740
Difference of statements,—	5,371	5,371	9,644	4,260	5,371	27,593	14,260	2,260	27,593	4,260
										6,760

I have not room for more—but here are indeed great differences, and if the changes were rung on all the differences between differences, what an odd figure would the account make: suffice it to say, that, between yours, and the statements in the table—the highest is 27,000, and the lowest 2,000 something where shall we look for the truth?

The avowed object of all this investigation was to elicit truth, but who will now say that it has been attained? I do not wish to be understood as meaning to say that either yourself, or any of the gentlemen in the foregoing table, have wilfully stated what you knew to be untrue; but this I do not hesitate to say, that you, one and all, ventured opinions upon information, which, if you had given yourselves time to reflect, you must have discovered, was totally insufficient to form so important a record. The calculations I have made shew this most clearly, and how very unsafe it is to depend upon "information," without being ourselves satisfied of its correctness, is amply proved from the case of Dr. Lee, who, relying on such sources has fallen into the most glaring errors, or rather, has proclaimed to the world the most glaring errors, to call them by the mildest name, of persons (unknown) who, from their residence in Canada, can scarcely offer any reasonable excuse for those errors.

There are two sensible answers given to the question, which could not find a place in the table.

*Mr. Rolph*—"I cannot say—I have *never* made such a calculation"—

*Mr. Robinson*—"I do not know, nor do I think any body else does."

On this point, one of these gentlemen has been consistent—the other has not—which of the two I mean will be seen hereafter.

The subject, now that there has been time for reflection, must be viewed by every candid mind as having been got up for party purposes, and the Report of the Committee on the petition of Buckley Waters and others, can be looked upon in no other light, than as having been the means of incurring a heavy expense to the Province, without answering any good purpose—its contents could only go to mislead the people—to mislead the British Government, and to injure particularly the Church of England, for it is not without errors with respect to others, an instance of which I think may be found in Mr. Morrison's Chart, where the Wesleyan Methodists are reckoned at 100 only.

I might go on to point out a great many more inconsistencies in your evidence—a few of them I shall endeavour to compress into as brief limits as I can.

You are asked, (at page 217) "Did many Presbyterians sign the Petition?"—You promptly reply "Yes," and by way of introducing an individual to the notice of the Committee, you add, "some of the principal signers are Presbyterians—the chairman of the Committee, (Central) *Mr. Ketchum*, is one of the leading Presbyterians in Upper Canada." There is something ridiculously ostentatious in this unnecessary addition in your reply to the question. Soon after (same page) you are told by the Committee—"It is stated in Mr. Morrison's Letter, that the Presbyterians refused to join the petitioners generally"—you answer, "by that part, who are members of the Church of Scotland, the petition was not *generally* signed."—Now, what *you* mean by "generally," I am at a loss clearly to understand—perhaps you can explain, and give us an abstract shewing to what particular denomination the 8000 signatures to that petition belonged—you will be able perhaps to inform us, by means of the "specific information" of the *pains taking* Secretary of the *Central Committee*, that it was "generally" signed by *one* denomination, and that, neither Presbyterians of "different classes," nor "members of the Church of Scotland." Make what *you* will of it, Mr. Morrison and your self are here at loggerheads. But with the next question, the cat comes out of the bag—"What do you attribute that to" (the Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland not joining in the petition?)—Ah! Mr. Ryerson, now for your answer—"They want to get half of the Clergy Reserves for themselves!" Ingrate, that you must be: did not Mr. Morris, "one of the leading" members of the Church of Scotland in Upper Canada, and in the House

of Assembly, move and vote, that they should *all* be sold for general purposes. This is unkind of you, Mr. Ryerson, and looks as if you were suspicious of those among whose ranks you have been fighting—But you add, (and you very often make additions not called for) “the largest proportion of Presbyterians in Upper Canada I believe signed the general petition.”—Your *sturdy* “Yes,” when first questioned on this part of the subject, after a little cross-examination, dwindled down into *modest* “I believe.” And here again, when you speak of the “*largest*” proportion of Presbyterians, it cannot pass unnoticed how completely you are at loggerheads with Dr. Lee.—The difference between you, can only be accounted for by the supposition, that he considers all Presbyterians as members of the Church of Scotland, and that you do not consider members of the Church of Scotland as entitled to the appellation of Presbyterians—odd enough I confess.

When the crusade against the Clergy Reserves was first undertaken, how admirably you seemed to pull together, but now that time has developed the plans of each, it is pretty evident that your “friendship was but a name,” and that though “generally” you are willing enough to pull down another church if you can, by any means, even by the most forced associations, you *individually* quarrel about the division of the spoil.

Your “object” you say was to vindicate several religious denominations. I take it, Sir, that you have misrepresented the Roman Catholics—you have confused “Presbyterians of different classes” and “members of the Church of Scotland” in such a way as to mislead and perplex, rather than vindicate—you have misrepresented the Church of England—you have misrepresented 88,819 of our population, by declaring them not attached to any religious denomination, or in almost heathenish darkness. These things will not be called vindication by any reasonable man.

Mr. Morrison’s Chart, you say, was compiled with much care—one omission which it makes is so remarkable, that I cannot forbear mentioning it—*he has not given a place in it to Roman Catholics*; and with respect to them I will venture an opinion: that, as a body compared with any other singly, there is every reason to suppose, your assertions to the contrary notwithstanding, and Mr. Morrison’s sinking them altogether, they are as numerous as any denomination—the Methodists not excepted. Had I been at your elbow in the Committee room when you was questioned as to this point, I would have reminded you of the thousands of Roman Catholics in the Eastern District—the many in the Midland District (Kingston, with a large stone Church, and a large and respectable congregation)—the thousands again in the new Settlements in the Newcastle District—the many in the Home District—the large and respectable congregation at York, with a neat Church—the many in the Townships near York—and the Western District, whose population in many parts of it, is chiefly Roman Catholic; besides the numbers scattered in different parts of the country which I have not enumerated—And yet you tell the Committee that Mr. Morrison’s Chart, got up under the superintendance of the “Central Committee”—“presents a very complete and fair view of the number of ministers and of the *different* religious denominations in Upper Canada”—“very complete and fair”—let us see—of Episcopalian it gives “no return”—Presbyterians “no return”—Kirk of Scotland “no return”—and Roman Catholics not so much as mentioned even by name as a religious denomination.

This is “very complete and fair” with a vengeance—perhaps you class the Roman Catholics, as another Mr. Ryerson has done, among the Heathen.

Again, (at page 218) speaking of the Church of England, you say in positive terms—“I know the number to be *very small*.” I might ask you *how* you know this, that you take upon yourself to state it so positively. You admit (at page 220) that they may *perhaps* amount to one tenth—this on your

own data would give 20,000—now what your ideas of “*very small*” may be, you must explain.

Again you say (page 218)—“the Congregations (Church of England) are generally *very small* (*very small again*—a favourite expression it seems, but a borrowed one, as I shall show by and by) “except in the Town of York, where there are a *number* of Government officers.” Here you make an admission, that the York congregation is large; but then, you would have the Committee believe that the reason of its being large, is, that it is made up of a “*umber* of Government officers.”—What is the fact?—Take the following enumeration of the Public Offices, and contradict it if you can:—

	<i>Episcop.</i>	<i>Pres.</i>	<i>R. Cath.</i>	<i>Meth.</i>		<i>Episcop.</i>	<i>Pres.</i>	<i>R. Cath.</i>	<i>Meth.</i>
Government Office,	2	1	1	0	Gazette office,	1	0	0	0
Ex. Council ”	4	0	0	1	Secretary’s Office,	2	0	0	0
Surveyor Gen. ”	5	0	0	0	Judges,	3	0	0	0
Receiver Gen. ”	2	1	0	0	Councillors,	4	0	0	0
Attorney General,	1	0	0	0	Clerk of the Peace,	1	0	0	0
Solicitor General,	1	0	0	0	Register,	1	0	0	0
Adjutant General,	2	0	0	0	Inspector,	0	0	1	0
Inspector General’s Office, 1		0	2	0	Sheriff,	1	0	0	0
Legislative Council office, 2	0	0	0	0					
Assembly Office,	1	0	0	2					
					Total, 34	2	4	3	

Of these then, we have 34 *Episcopalian*, who attend the Church of England in York, and surely you do not call this “*a number*” in the sense which you evidently use the term, to account for the congregation being *large*—if you do, how do you account for your calling 20,000 a “*very small number*.” The fact therefore is, that the congregation at York is *large*, and that the “*number*” of Government officers, who from your representation, if this calculation were not made, might have passed for a host, large enough of itself to fill the church, amounts to the *enormous* total of 34! Oh, Mr. Ryerson, what between “*very small*” and “*number*”—calling 20,000 by the former term, and 34 by the latter, you certainly exhibit a degree of inconsistency seldom surpassed; but you had an “*object*” in view.

You see how matters stand with you when your *assertions* are brought to the test of a little cool calculation, founded upon fact. Many others of your assertions would, if brought to the same test, show the same result, but as by this time I fancy I can hear you cry—“*spare me*”—I shall at present mention only one thing more.

In the resolutions of the House of Assembly in 1826, it is among other things “Resolved, That the number of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this Province is a *very small*, (I promised to show you that “*very small*,” was a borrowed expression of yours) proportion to the number of other Christian denominations.”—You are asked by the committee—“It appears that they (the Resolutions) were moved by *Mr. Rolph*, is he a member of the Church of England?”—You answer—“he is a member of the Church of England, educated at Cambridge, and I believe a member of Lincoln’s Inn”—There, I can fancy you saying to yourself, is a clencher for you gentlemen. But will you, or can you, Mr. Ryerson, explain for *Mr. Rolph*, how it happens, that he could seriously propose this Resolution as matter of fact, when not long after, this same *Mr. Rolph*, when before a committee of the House of Assembly, being asked—“What proportion, in your *opinion*, do the members of the Church of England bear to the whole population?”—Mark *Mr. Rolph’s answer*!—“I cannot say, I have NEVER made such a calculation”!!

And yet, although on this occasion *Mr. Rolph* admits that he “*never*” ad made such a calculation, had nevertheless moved, that it be resolved, and was resolved accordingly, that the proportion is “*very small*.” In the one case, his “*opinion*” only is asked, and he declines giving any opinion, because he had “*never made such a calculation*;” and in the other, “*never*” having made “*such a calculation*,” he resolves it into matter of *fact*, to be solemnly recorded on the *proceedings* of a grave deliberative body.

I promised to point out to you a gentleman who had not been consistent on this subject. I have done so.

You introduce (page 219) the Alien Question into your evidence. As I have been drawn to mention *Mr. Rolph's* name, and am asking you for explanations on some points in which he is concerned, perhaps you can explain to me who it is that Mr. Horton, under Secretary of the Colonies, alludes to, when he says, (page 306)—“*with respect to the conduct of the Colonial department, it is necessary to mention, that these instructions (on the Alien Question) which Lord Bathurst sent out to the Colony, for the passing of a local Bill, and which excited dissatisfaction, WERE REGULATIONS WHICH HAD RECEIVED THE APPROBATION OF A MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE, who was over in this country, more or less in the character of an Agent for the Province, with respect to certain grievances complained of.*” Rumour will have it, that, “a member of the Church of England, educated at Cambridge, and I believe a member of Lincoln's Inn,” is the person alluded to by Mr. Horton, as the “*member of the Legislature*” and “*Agent*” who *approved* of “*Regulations*” in London, which he *disapproved* of elsewhere. There appears to have been some collision between the members of the Legislature and the “*Agent*;” but perhaps it is hardly fair to call upon you to give explanation of the inconsistencies of others, when so many of your own have been pointed out which require to be answered. Mr. Rolph will doubtless see these remarks, and can, if he pleases, answer for himself.

If you, Sir, are able to explain away what I have said on your evidence, or to contradict the remarks I have made upon it by any thing like proof, you have an opportunity of doing so. That evidence now stands naked and exposed to the view of every man—if you decline saying any thing, do not indulge yourself with the idea, that your silence will be construed into a dignity which will not condescend to a reply. You must stand convicted of inconsistencies the most glaring and absurd.

#### CALCULATOR.

Dec. 1829.

---

B. FERGUSON, PRINTER....GORE BALANCE OFFICE, HAMILTON, U. C.





FINE BINDING BY G. SCHMIDLECHNER 1974

